

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting
Monday, February 27, 2006**

1. CONVENE: 7:02 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Ms. McNamara
3. ROLL CALL: President Cunningham, Vice President Cook, Kohlstrand, Lynch, and McNamara.

Mr. Lynch was absent from roll call, and arrived at the beginning of Item 4.

Ms. Mariani was absent.

Also present were Planning and Building Director Cathy Woodbury, Supervising Planner Andrew Thomas, Deputy City Attorney Julie Harryman, Planner III Douglas Garrison, Planner II Emily Pudell, Planning Intern Stefanie Hom, Acting Recreation and Parks Directors Dale Lillard.

4. MINUTES:

- a. Minutes for the meeting of February 13, 2006.

Vice President Cook advised that page 7, paragraph 3, should be changed to read, "Vice President Cook believed there was beautiful public access *along the shoreline*."

M/S Kohlstrand/McNamara to approve the minutes for the meeting of February 13, 2006, as amended.

AYES – 4 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 1 (McNamara)

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

President Cunningham advised that he had received requests from the Board to pull the entire Consent Calendar and place it on the Regular Agenda.

M/S Cook/McNamara and unanimous to remove Items 7-A, 7-B and 7-C from the Consent Calendar and place them on the Regular Agenda.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Ms. Woodbury noted that a speaker had arrived after the item had been closed.

M/S Cook/Kohlstrand and unanimous to reopen the public hearing.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

Mr. Jon Spangler invited the Board members to a forum on open government sponsored by the League of Women Voters and the other seven Leagues of Alameda County, to be held on Friday, March 17, in San Lorenzo. Bill Lockyer, Attorney General of the State of California, would be the keynote speaker. Sunshine laws and open government would be addressed during this forum.

On a personal note, Mr. Spangler noted that the bus shelter installed on Santa Clara did not shelter the occupants during a driving rain earlier in the day. He added that people waiting for the bus were huddled under the awning of the nearby church, and that the shelter desperately needed sides. He noted that the metal bench was very cold, and the wind and rain went through the shelter. He hoped those problems could be remedied.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 7-A. **PDA05-0007/MDR05-0350 – Park Street Landing – 2307 Blanding Avenue (EP).** Applicant requests a Planned Development Amendment and Minor Design Review to modify the existing sign program to allow for a change in the location of existing building signage, including installation and establishment of three additional signs on an existing monument sign. The site is located within the Park Street Landing Shopping Center in the C-M-PD, Commercial Manufacturing, Planned Development Zoning District. **(Continued from the meeting of February 13, 2006.)**

M/S Cook/McNamara and unanimous to remove Item 7-A from the Consent Calendar and place it on the Regular Agenda.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

Ms. Pudell summarized the staff report, and recommended approval of this item.

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Vice President Cook noted that she had requested that this item be removed, and was concerned about adding further signs on the pylon sign for this project. She believed that the pylon sign was not an attractive gateway sign, and had always found it to be unattractive. She also objected to the Cigarettes Cheaper sign at that location.

Ms. McNamara concurred with Vice President Cook's comments and noted that the clock did not work. She believed that contributed to the sign being an eyesore, and inquired whether it could be fixed and maintained.

Ms. Pudell noted that the conditions of approval state that the clock shall be repaired and maintained in operable condition; that would be enforceable through the resolution. She noted that the Cigarettes Cheaper sign was not approved by staff, and that it could be brought to the applicant's attention to be removed. The allotment of the three signs on the pylon would only be allowable to tenants who lease more than 4800 square feet of floor area.

President Cunningham echoed the concerns about the main pylon at the City's entrance, and would like to limit the amount of signage at that location without penalizing the retail units.

Mr. Foley, applicant, agreed with the Board's concerns about the Alameda gateway. He noted that he would be happy to update the sign, and agreed it was dated; he would also repair and maintain the clock. He did not like the sandwich board signs. He noted that Kragen would not go in the center

unless the sign faced Park Street. He believed the signage program was dated.

President Cunningham inquired whether approval of the pylon sign could be deleted and returned at a later date. Ms. Pudell agreed with that request.

M/S Kohlstrand/Cook and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-06-08 to approve a Planned Development Amendment and Minor Design Review to modify the existing sign program to allow for a change in the location of existing building signage. The approval of the pylon sign would be withdrawn from this resolution, and staff would bring it before the Planning Board after working further with the applicant.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

7-B. **FDP05-0004/DR05-0129– Barry Vial – 1951 Harbor Bay Parkway (DG).** The applicant requests approval of Final Development Plan and Major Design Review applications allowing the construction of two new commercial buildings. Building 1 is a 28,392 sq. ft., approximately 28 ft. high, two-story building. Building 2 is a 15,178 sq. ft., approximately 25 feet high single-story building. The proposed use of these buildings is a mix of light industrial and professional offices. The two buildings would contain up to 13 separate units. Specific businesses that would occupy the buildings have not been identified at this time. The project site is zoned C-M-PD Commercial Manufacturing, Planned Development Zoning District.

M/S Cook/McNamara and unanimous to remove Item 7-B from the Consent Calendar and place it on the Regular Agenda.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

Mr. Garrison summarized the staff report and recommended approval of this item.

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Ms. Kohlstrand noted that she had requested that this item be pulled from the Consent Calendar. She had visited the site and was concerned about the change in the character in the buildings and their relationship to the street over a period of time. She believed that the original design concepts for Harbor Bay were being left behind, and that it was becoming more critical to maintain the public relationship with the street and waterfront area. She noted that she had attended a workshop at the O Club with several other Board members that addressed design features for the FISC property. The main comment was that there was too much parking surrounding that site. She did not want that kind of building and relationship of the buildings to the site plan at the other end of Alameda. She believed a better approach was required for this site.

Vice President Cook agreed with Ms. Kohlstrand's comments.

President Cunningham believed that bringing the buildings closer to the sidewalk created an oppressive feeling; he preferred a larger setback as long as there was a sufficient setback.

Mr. Garrison noted that this business park was approved in the 1980s, with the design philosophies of that time; he added that was the genesis of the broad setbacks. He noted that the landscaping was quite mature and other areas were more sparse. Staff would follow up with that situation through the Planning Department; landscaping requirements would be used to provide a smooth transition from the open space to the business park.

Mr. Steve McKeem, project architect, described the site layout and believed the visual relief of the

setback was functional.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. Kohlstrand whether the eleven parking spaces above the Code requirement could be eliminated, Mr. McKeem noted that Harbor Bay had different parking requirements than the City.

Mr. Garrison noted that the development agreement with the Harbor Bay Business Park had a requirement that the regulations in effect at the time it was signed apply. The parking standards from the 1980s would be the standards in effect, which in some cases require more parking standards than the current standards. He believed it made sense to use the current parking standards, as stated in the staff report.

Ms. Kohlstrand would be comfortable with the current standards, and would like the applicant to explore replacing the additional parking spaces with landscaping.

Ms. Woodbury noted that she would be happy to work with the applicant in that regard. She added that the Fire Department's EVA requirements must be included in the revised plan.

M/S Kohlstrand/Cook and unanimous to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-06-09 to approve approval of Final Development Plan and Major Design Review applications allowing the construction of two new commercial buildings. Building 1 is a 28,392 sq. ft., approximately 28 ft. high, two-story building. Building 2 is a 15,178 sq. ft., approximately 25 feet high single-story building. The proposed use of these buildings is a mix of light industrial and professional offices. The two buildings would contain up to 13 separate units. Specific businesses that would occupy the buildings have not been identified at this time.

AYES – 5 (Mariani absent); NOES – 0; ABSTAIN – 0

7-C. **Use Permit UP06-0002, Major Design Review DR06-0007 – City of Alameda Recreation and Parks; 740 Central Avenue (SH).** The applicant requests Use Permit and Design Review approval to allow the construction of a permanent 1,920 square-foot (40' by 48') recreation building that will replace an existing temporary structure. Pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.19.b(3), a Use Permit is required for structures located on public and private land in the O (Open Space) District. The site is located at Washington Park within the O, Open Space Zoning District.

Ms. Hom summarized the staff report and recommended approval of this item.

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Vice President Cook noted that she had pulled this item from the Consent Calendar, and was very concerned about the design of this building. She did not believe it blended well with the beauty of the parks, and the building looked like a temporary modular building.

Ms. Hom confirmed that it was a modular building, but that landscaping would surround the building and that it would be setback 113 feet from the street.

Dale Lillard, Acting Recreation and Parks Director, noted that the Recreation Commission echoed Board member Cook's concern about the design, and that they were very conscious of making it blend into the neighborhood and that it be similar to the other buildings in the area. A stucco exterior and pitched roof would dress the building up, and he confirmed that cost issues drove the modular design. The project is funded by a \$300,000 State grant. He noted that the original rec. center had burned to the ground, and that it was not cost-effective to replace the original design.

Ms. McNamara was concerned about the design as seen from the street, and requested that it be dressed up. Mr. Lillard replied that the landscaping could be enhanced so it would not be as visible from the street.

President Cunningham noted that this building lacked the usual articulation of structures in the area, and suggested wooden trellises or other embellishments without losing its functionality to the public.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. McNamara regarding the life of such a building, Mr. Lillard replied that properly maintained, it should last approximately 25 years. He noted that Bayport would not contain modular buildings.

Ms. McNamara expressed concern that cost issues would drive the use of additional modular buildings. Mr. Lillard replied that the joint use agreement with the School District would require meeting their criteria, and that there were no plans to include modular buildings at Bayport.

Mr. Lynch noted that he did not care for this design, but that the needs of the community must be balanced. He would have liked to see a stone façade over cinderblock, and noted that this was an indictment of the City's financial status.

Vice President Cook believed the City Council should balance the expenditures of the funds, and that the Planning Board's concerns should beg the question of design versus public services.

Mr. Lynch noted that there was similar discussion by Rec. and Parks, and that there was a tremendous need for services in the City. He agreed with Vice President Cook's concerns, but would defer to the Rec. and Parks Commission with respect to the need for the functionality.

Ms. Kohlstrand agreed with Mr. Lynch's assessment, and believed additional landscaping treatment would be helpful.

President Cunningham believed this was a unique situation in that this was a City building, and added that the City Council was the ultimate client. He suggested giving the City Council a chance to do a better job on this design.

Ms. Woodbury noted that she would work with the Rec. and Parks Department in achieving the Board's design suggestions.

M/S Kohlstrand/McNamara to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-06-10 to approve Use Permit and Design Review approval to allow the construction of a permanent 1,920 square-foot (40' by 48') recreation building that will replace an existing temporary structure. Pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.19.b(3), a Use Permit is required for structures located on public and private land in the O (Open Space) District. Additional landscaping would be added around the building, and the applicant would work with the Planning Director to improve the design.

AYES – 3 (Mariani absent); NOES – 2 (Cunningham, Cook); ABSTAIN – 0

The motion failed.

Vice President Cook noted that she would like to get more funding for a building with a 25-year life cycle.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Lynch regarding the grant cycle, Mr. Lillard replied that the funded need to be expended by 2008. He added that there was a demand for reasonable after-school care, which this building would help provide.

President Cunningham would support the addition of other built structures to embellish the design, such as a trellis.

Ms. Woodbury noted that color and different window styles would add to the building. In response

to Vice President Cook's question whether there would be time for bringing new drawings to the Board, Ms. Woodbury believed that would be difficult.

Mr. Lillard noted that they hoped to use the building in the summer.

M/S Kohlstrand/McNamara to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-06-10 to approve Use Permit and Design Review approval to allow the construction of a permanent 1,920 square-foot (40' by 48') recreation building that will replace an existing temporary structure. Pursuant to AMC Subsection 30-4.19.b(3), a Use Permit is required for structures located on public and private land in the O (Open Space) District. The applicant would work with the Planning and Building Director regarding landscaping and additional articulation, and would return to the Planning Board if that could not be achieved.

AYES – 4 (Mariani absent); NOES – 1 (Cook); ABSTAIN – 0

8. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 8-A. **FDP05-0003/DR05-0127/TM05-0003 – Venture Corporation – 2201 Harbor Bay Parkway (DG).** The applicant requests approval of Final Development Plan and Major Design Review applications allowing the construction of three new two-story commercial buildings. The buildings would range in size from 13,946 to 16,952 sq. ft. in size, with a maximum height of 34 ft. The proposed use of these buildings is a mix of research and development facilities and professional offices. The three buildings would contain up to 24 separate units. Specific businesses that would occupy the buildings have not been identified at this time. The applicant also requests approval of a Tentative Parcel Map/Condominium Plan allowing the conveyance of the 24 units to separate owners. **(Continued from the meeting of February 13, 2006.)**

Mr. Garrison presented the staff report, and recommended approval of this item.

In response to an inquiry by Member Lynch regarding location of the parking, Ms. Harryman confirmed that the language stated that the parking “should be located at the rear or side of the property.”

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Stuart Scheinholtz, Development Manager, Venture Corporation, 600 Miller Avenue, Mill Valley, applicant, updated the Board on the progress of the project and noted that Phase I of this project had 15 properties, 14 of which have been sold; 13 of those properties had closed. He noted that these small businesses had previously been shut out of the Alameda real estate market and wish to have an ownership share in Alameda. He noted that the architecture was meant to blend into the community, and wished to put Phase II into context.

Mr. Brock Grayson, project architect, Ware Malcomb, 5000 Executive Parkway, San Ramon, displayed the proposed project on the overhead screen and described its features. He noted that the view to the Bay was a very important component of the design.

Mr. Jason Cheng, 346 Anderson Road, Alameda, spoke in support of this project. He noted that he was a co-owner of one of the units in Phase I, and added that the ability to own their own property gives him freedom and evidence of an increased level of success in the business community. He was happy to not be under the control of a landlord, and added that the views were very attractive. He believed the applicant has tried to maximize the views and give the owners something to be proud of.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

In response to an inquiry by Ms. McNamara how the mature landscaping and the bay views could be reconciled, Mr. Grayson replied that while it was tricky, they tried to achieve both by determining the value to the buyers. They wished to make sure they were welcome in the City and followed the design guidelines. All owners have a second floor with unobstructed views, and landscaping screened the first floor.

Member Kohlstrand noted that during her site visit, most of the ground floor blinds were drawn, while the second floor blinds were open; she wondered if the business owners tried to provide their own screening from the parking lot. Mr. Grayson noted that parking at the front of the building was

an important element in getting people into the building.

Member Kohlstrand noted that while the applicant stated the design was a compromise, she did not notice a difference from the last design. Mr. Grayson noted that it was a compromise between the some Board Members' wishes that the buildings face the street, and others' wishes to face the back. He added that they sold the parking spaces, which were identified for the buyers; he noted that was a major marketing advantages for the buyers.

Vice President Cook noted that this project was very good for the buyers, but was unsure whether this was the best project for the City of Alameda. She complimented the applicant on the presentation, but did believe that changes could be made to reflect the Planning Board's comments. She would like the site plan to be less intensive, and did not see any changes since the last meeting. She noted that the location of the employee area was of concern to her, and she was unmoved from her previous position.

Mr. Grayson displayed the slide identifying the sitting area on the southwest side of Building C, and added that a secondary area could be added closer to Harbor Bay.

Mr. Scheinholtz stated that this was the 20th iteration of this design. He noted that some of the issues raised by the Board could not be accommodated according to the Fire Department.

Member Lynch believed the bigger issue was the City's concern about a work plan as it relates to design review for the business park.

President Cunningham noted that his comments on the previous project stand, and he preferred the current proposal. He could support this proposal, and noted that Phase I was a pre-existing condition. He noted that in Scheme D, it was better to have an environment captured by all the buildings than trying to have a hodge-podge of buildings with no relationship between Phase I and Phase II. He believed that approach produced a more cohesive master plan. He added that the view of Alameda from Oakland was of a greenbelt of trees, and that a green tree-lined shoreline would be the view of this part of Alameda. He understood the applicant's concerns about emergency access and the Fire Department's reservations about outlets at North Loop and Harbor Bay.

Member Kohlstrand supported Vice President Cook's statements, and could not support the site plan as proposed.

Vice President Cook believed that further work could be done with the relationship between the two phases to reach a true compromise.

Mr. Grayson noted that people using the promenade would see parking when looking at the building, and understood that was one of the Board's main objections. He believed the contextual evidence provided at this meeting showed the lanes of Harbor Bay Parkway, the greenbelt and the building's landscaping. He believed it was unlikely that a pedestrian along the waterfront would not be particularly upset about seeing the building's parking because of the berm and the hedging. They wished to maximize the use for the buyers, who would spend 10-12 hours a day in this building. He understood Vice President Cook's concerns about the waterfront views.

President Cunningham believed pitched roofs and more articulation would improve the appearance

of the buildings, especially in relation to the waterfront.

Mr. Grayson noted that while people use the waterfront for amenities, he emphasized that this was a business park, albeit an attractive one. He noted that this was not a retail center.

Member Kohlstrand expressed concern that there were no other amenities for the employees, and did not intend to require the applicant to add retail. She noted that how the site relates to the waterfront, and how the site itself functions, were very important. She compared this site with the previous Harbor Bay project discussed by the Planning Board, and added that there was more of a landscape treatment, with parking tucked around the back. She noted that this was a suburban environment for the business park, and believed there was a better so in providing building surrounded by parking. She believed there could be a more harmonious relationship between the buildings and the green space.

Mr. Grayson respectfully disagreed with Member Kohlstrand's last comment.

Ms. Woodbury suggested that if more landscaping around the lower floor offices would help the Board approve the project, staff could work with the applicant in achieving that goal.

Vice President Cook encouraged the applicants to strike a compromise with respect to the areas of concern expressed by the Board. She preferred Plan C, but would like more frontage along Harbor Bay Parkway; she liked the setback on that plan.

Member Lynch noted that he liked Plans C and D, and added that this was not a retail space. He acknowledged that this item may need to go to City Council to be resolved.

In response to an inquiry by Member Lynch regarding the required quorum, Ms. Harryman replied that if one of the Board members brought a motion to approve the project, and it was defeated 2-3, the applicant would have the ability to appeal to Council within 10 days.

M/S Lynch/Cunningham to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-06-11 to deny Final Development Plan and Major Design Review applications allowing the construction of three new two-story commercial buildings. The buildings would range in size from 13,946 to 16,952 sq. ft. in size, with a maximum height of 34 ft. The proposed use of these buildings is a mix of research and development facilities and professional offices. The three buildings would contain up to 24 separate units. Specific businesses that would occupy the buildings have not been identified at this time. The applicant also requests approval of a Tentative Parcel Map/Condominium Plan allowing the conveyance of the 24 units to separate owners.

AYES – 2 (Mariani absent); NOES – 3 (Cook, Kohlstrand, McNamara); ABSTAIN – 0

The motion failed.

8-B. **Northern Waterfront General Plan Amendment (AT).** A public hearing to obtain public comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Northern Waterfront General Plan amendments. The Northern Waterfront area includes a number of properties generally located along the Oakland/Alameda Estuary between Sherman Street, Grand Street, and Buena Vista Avenue.

Mr. Thomas summarized this staff report, and noted that comments were being received on the Draft EIR circulated on February 1, 2006. The public comment period will close on March 30, 2006.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Barbara Kerr, President, Northside Association, 1822 Bay, wished to address the areas adjacent to her residential area. She expressed concern about the Pacific Storage site, and added that the concentrated housing as envisioned by the Northern Waterfront Specific Plan committee had become the site for the storage company. She noted that senior housing had been envisioned for that area, and added that a major transportation hub was located at the corner of Webster and Atlantic. She requested a copy of the final minutes of the Northern Waterfront Specific Plan meeting. She added that the Association strongly supported the development of streets allowing for parking on both sides. She advised that she would submit her written comments.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Member Kohlstrand noted that on page 4B-1, the paragraph relating to population should be re-examined. She noted that it stated, "Between 1990 and 2000, the number of households in Alameda decreased by 1,148, or by less than 4% when compared to the 1990 base of 29,078 households." She noted that it also stated that the 2000 year base was 30,226; she believed that was an increase, rather than a decline. She noted that under the Noise Element, the noise mitigation will be taken into account on an individual project basis. She knew there were recommended guidelines in the Plan that discourage sound walls unless absolutely necessary; she wanted to leave room for other options and design treatments such as expanded setbacks.

Mr. Thomas anticipated that there would be considerable discussion about this proposed policy. He noted that the City had run into problems in the past (such as the Catellus project on Atlantic), based on the current General Plan policy, it was interpreted that front yards were active recreational spaces and can be exposed to a certain amount of noise, but backyards should not be. He noted that the City hoped to make design decisions to protect yard spaces, and to put the sound wall issue to rest.

Member Lynch noted that he did not agree with the last section of the Employment Section B, and added that he did not fault ABAG for the numbers provided by the City, although he may not agree with the methodology. He believed that there should be a statement that the employment numbers were not close to reality, and did not want them to affect the jobs-housing numbers in the future.

President Cunningham agreed with Member Lynch's statement, especially with regard to the median home price being listed as \$332,000; he wished that would be true. He did not know what the impact these incorrect numbers would have on requirements placed on the City with respect to affordable housing; he advised that current numbers be used.

In response to an inquiry by President Cunningham regarding additional marinas, Mr. Thomas

Planning Board Minutes
February 27, 2006

replied that two additional marinas were being proposed on the other two sides of the Encinal Terminal site. An additional marina plan was approved by the Planning Board about four years ago just for the Alaska Packers. That permit has since expired, and Mr. Wong was considering resubmitting with a different configuration. He noted that the Board will hear the recommendation by the Northern Waterfront Advisory Committee (Policy ET-11, page 12), stating that there should not be any berths along the northern edge of Encinal Terminals.

Member Lynch believed that the City did need marinas, and that they were a tremendous asset to the City. He noted that there were many vistas around the Island with unobstructed views, and that marinas at this location would enhance the experience in Alameda.

No action was taken.

9. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

Ms. Woodbury advised that the League of Women Voters communication had been distributed to the Board members.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATION:

- a. Oral Status Report regarding the Northern Waterfront Plan (Vice-President Cook).

Vice President Cook advised that there had been no further meetings.

- b. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland/Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board member Mariani).

Ms. Mariani was not in attendance to present this report.

- c. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation subcommittee (Board member Kohlstrand).

Ms. Kohlstrand advised that there had been no further meetings.

12. STAFF COMMUNICATION:

Ms. Woodbury advised that Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft had been nominated to the Planning Board at the last City Council meeting, and would be accepting the nomination at the next City Council meeting.

Ms. Woodbury noted that the land tour schedule was still being developed, and that two consecutive Fridays were being considered. She added that two different tours or a Saturday tour were also being considered.

President Cunningham noted that this had been Ms. Harryman's last meeting, and thanked her for her service to Alameda.

Ms. Woodbury advised that Donna Mooney would be working with the Planning Board in Ms. Harryman's place.

In response to an inquiry by Member Kohlstrand whether the Planning Board members were required to go to a work session related to Planning Boards that were compensated for their meetings, Ms. Woodbury advised that she would check into that issue and report back.

President Cunningham clarified that none of the Board members were compensated.

Ms. McNamara inquired about the status of the Bridgeside project, and added that it was going very slowly. Ms. Woodbury did not have the current status available, but knew that the site was very wet.

13. ADJOURNMENT: 9:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Woodbury Secretary
Planning & Building Department

These minutes were approved at the April 10, Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and video taped.